



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/000,121	10/31/2001	Paresh L. Nagda	TRMB-2097	8976
70409 7590 08/07/2008 TRIMBLE NAVIGATION LIMITED C/O WAGNER BLECHER 123 WESTRIDGE DRIVE WATSONVILLE, CA 95076				
EXAMINER PLUCINSKI, JAMISUE A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3629				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/07/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/000,121

Applicant(s)

NAGDA ET AL.

Examiner

JAMISUE A. PLUCINSKI

Art Unit

3629

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-30 and 33-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-30 and 33-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
3. Claims 1, 3, 4-19, 26-28, 30, 33-35 and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt et al. (5,835,716) in view of Williams et al. (6,560,509).
4. With respect to Claim 1: Hunt discloses the use of an information exchange system comprising:
 - a. A link to a communication network coupled to a plurality of partner databases storing information related to carrier availability (Hunt discloses the use of a partner subsystem (9) with a request database, that is different from the transportation database,

and which ports data to the centralized database, which stores demand specification information, See Claims 6-9, Column 4, lines 45-62).

b. A database (50) coupled to a communications network (10), for storing a demand entry comprising shipping demand specifications and carrier entries (Column 4, lines 27-44, Hunt discloses the database is for storing data for the carrier space listed or requested. The examiner considers the carrier space listed to be the carrier entry and the carrier space requested to be the demand entry), wherein the demand entry and carrier entry arrive through the communications network (Column 4, Lines 45-58); and

c. A logic unit coupled to the database, for receiving a demand entries and matches demands with carrier entries (microprocessor 12, and Column 4, lines 27-44).

5. Hunt however fails to disclose selecting one of a plurality of carriers, and automatically booking the selected carrier in response to the demand entry. Williams discloses the use of automatically booking a selected carrier, based on an attribute such as capacity and location, and automatically booking the carrier (See Reference numerals 612 and 622, Column 7, line 20 to Column 8, line 39). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of selecting and booking a carrier of Hunt, to be automated as disclosed by Williams, because the use of known techniques of automating the selection and booking of a carrier would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. (See KSR [127 S Ct. at 1739] “The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results.”).

6. With respect to Claim 3: Hunt discloses the logic unit notifies a user when a demand entry or a carrier entry is received (Column 8, lines 41-62).
7. With respect to Claim 4: Hunt discloses the use of a subsystem (8, which forwards the demand entries to the central database). The examiner considers this subsystem to be a form of an enterprise resource planning system.
8. With respect to Claims 6-11, 17, 18, 28: Hunt discloses the use of generating reports using queries (which the examiner considers to be criterion) (Column 9, line 41 to Column 10, line 2). It should be noted that what specific information is on the reports is considered to be non-functional language, which is unrelated to the "system" claim. A system claim is drawn to the structural limitations of the system only, therefore the system would remain the same whether the reports generated contained demand information or carrier information, or were based on date ranges or time frames. The type of information that is printed on the reports is deemed non-function descriptive material. The system would remain the same no matter what information is on the reports, thus this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed.Cir.1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).
9. With respect to Claim 12: Hunt discloses the shipping demand specification comprises a route (See Claim 1).
10. With respect to Claim 13: Hunt discloses the carrier availability information comprises carrier volume and date/time, which the examiner considers to be cargo dimension, and date of availability (See Claims 1 and 2).

11. With respect to Claim 14: Hunt discloses the processor using a RDB locator, which signals the system operator, or user, when a match has been located (Column 8, lines 53-62).
12. With respect to Claim 15: Hunt discloses the logic unit provides a user with the ability to make capacity based arrangements (See Claim 1).
13. With respect to Claim 16: Hunt discloses the logic unit provides a user with the option to conduct a transaction over the communications network (See Claim 12, Hunt discloses sending a bill or transaction code, therefore the examiner considers this to provide a transaction).
14. With respect to Claim 19: Hunt discloses the user request is entered and therefore stored, therefore the examiner considers this to be an implied request (Claim 1, item f).
15. With respect to Claim 26: Hunt discloses the logic unit formulates the response when a new entry is received (column 8, lines 36-40).
16. With respect to Claim 27: Hunt discloses the logic unit formulates the response at a pre-determined time interval (Column 8, lines 53-56).
17. With respect to Claim 30: Hunt discloses the use of a method comprising:
 - d. Receiving a demand entry from a user comprising shipping demand specifications (See Claim 1);
 - e. Receiving a carrier entry comprising demand specifications and carrier availability (See abstract);
 - f. Storing entries in a database (Column 4, lines 26-44);
18. Hunt however fails to disclose selecting one of a plurality of carriers, and automatically booking the selected carrier in response to the demand entry. Williams discloses the use of automatically booking a selected carrier, based on an attribute such as capacity and location, and

automatically booking the carrier (See Reference numerals 612 and 622, Column 7, line 20 to Column 8, line 39). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of selecting and booking a carrier of Hunt, to be automated as disclosed by Williams, because the use of known techniques of automating the selection and booking of a carrier would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. (See KSR [127 S Ct. at 1739] “The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results.”).

19. With respect to Claims 31 and 32: Hunt discloses the use of a partner subsystem (9) with a request database, that is different from the transportation database, which stores demand specification information (See Claims 6-9, Column 4, lines 45-62).

20. With respect to Claim 33: Hunt discloses the use of a subsystem (8, which forwards the demand entries to the central database). The examiner considers this subsystem to be a form of an enterprise resource planning system.

21. With respect to Claim 35: Hunt discloses the processor using a RDB locator, which signals the system operator, or user, when a match has been located (Column 8, lines 53-62).

22. With respect to Claim 37: Hunt discloses providing a user with a match of the demand and carrier specifications (Column 4, lines 45-58).

23. With respect to Claim 38: Hunt discloses the use of requests parameters, which the examiner considers to be a form of criterion (Column 8, lines 36-40).

24. With respect to Claim 39: Hunt discloses the shipping demand specification comprises a route (See Claim 1). And the carrier availability information comprises carrier volume and

date/time, which the examiner considers to be cargo dimension, and date of availability (See Claims 1 and 2).

25. With respect to Claims 5 and 34: Hunt, as disclosed above for Claims 1 and 30, fails to disclose the logic unit allows a user to define a subgroup within the exchange system, and assign unrestricted access to only members of the subgroup. The examiner takes official notice that the use of defining a group who has unrestricted access to the system is old and well known in the art. Each computer system/network has a group of users, which have administrative rights. Administrative rights on the system or network gives a user unrestricted access to data as well as to the system itself. This is done on any Windows ® network product, such as Windows NT ®. Therefore it would have been old to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have the system of Hunt, allow a subgroup of users be assigned administrative rights, to have unrestricted access to the system, in order for the subgroup of people to have complete control over the data, for configuration purposes, and for problem solving purposes.

26. Claims 20-25, 29, 36 and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt et al. (5,835,716) and Williams (6,560,509) and further in view of Nel (US 2003/0036935).

27. With respect to Claims 20 and 40: Hunt and Williams, as disclosed above for Claims 1 and 30, fails to disclose the use of a fleet monitoring system which monitors vehicles. Nel discloses the use of an allocating system for freight haulage jobs, which has a fleet monitoring system which uses GPS to locate vehicles (See Figure 1, satellites 30 and 32 with corresponding detailed description). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to modify the system of Hunt, to include a fleet monitoring system of Nel, in order to fill excess capacity of a vehicle, at any time during their transportation. (See Nel, abstract)

28. With respect to Claim 21: Nel discloses the logic unit alerts a delivery vehicle when a new demand entry matches a location of the delivery vehicle as determined by the fleet monitoring system (Paragraph 0026 and 0039).

29. With respect to Claim 22: Nel discloses that each of the delivery vehicles contains a GPS unit and a wireless modem that transmits location data for each of the delivery vehicles to the fleet monitoring system (Paragraphs 0027 and 0028).

30. With respect to Claim 23: Nel discloses the wireless modem provides an internet connection to the fleet monitoring system (Paragraphs 0029 and 0030).

31. With respect to Claim 24: Nel discloses the delivery vehicle contains a portal allowing a driver to see demands from the database (Paragraph 0027-0029, Nel discloses each vehicle has a mobile communications unit which accesses job allocation services provided by the job manager, therefore the examiner considering this to be a portal, which is fully capable of allowing a driver to view demand entries).

32. With respect to Claim 25: Nel discloses the GPS and wireless modem automatically transmits location data for the delivery vehicles to the fleet monitoring system and the logic unit uses the location data in determining whether to send an alert to the delivery vehicle (Paragraphs 0015 and 0026).

33. With respect to Claims 29 and 36: Nel, discloses for each vehicle, the rates are given in the carrier specification (Paragraph 0037) and the matching of demands and carriers are based on bid prices as well as rates (Paragraphs 0006, 0045 and 0047)

34. With respect to Claim 41: Nel discloses alerting a delivery vehicle when the location of the delivery vehicles matches a parameter of a demand entry (Paragraphs 0032-0039).

35. With respect to Claim 42: Nel discloses the delivery vehicles comprise a location determining unit and a wireless connected to a communications network (Paragraphs 0029 and 0030).

Response to Arguments

36. Applicant's arguments, see 11, filed 5/20/08, with respect to the 112 1st paragraph rejection have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection has been withdrawn.

37. Applicant's arguments filed 5/20/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

38. With respect to Applicant's argument that there is no motivation to combine Hunt and Williams: the applicant has stated that Hunt teaches away from the combination, due to the fact that hunt discloses the term "must be confirmed" in the abstract which teaches way from the automatic booking of Williams. Hunt uses those terms in the abstract, however never discloses who does the confirming. The system can do the confirming, and therefore cause the automatic booking. Furthermore the booking can be done automatically as an unconfirmed booking. Simply because there may be an additional step to confirm the booking, does not teach away

from it being automatically booked. It is the examiner's position that Hunt does not teach away from the automatic booking of Williams, and therefore the rejection stands as stated above.

39. With respect to Applicant's argument of the Official Notice: The applicant stated that the official notice is unsupported. Zurko, as stated by the applicant states that "It is never appropriate to rely SOLELY on common knowledge in the art without evidentiary support in the record...". This statement means that it is not appropriate to rely ONLY on official notice, however in the same section of the MPEP as was quoted by the applicant it states that official notice can be used to "fill in the gaps" in an insubstantial manner. Therefore, if the examiner had to provide documentary support for the official notice, then official notice would not be needed. Therefore, it is the examiner's position that the official notice has support and no more is needed. The applicant has also not provided a correct challenge to the official notice. The applicant has stated "allowing a user to define a subgroup of shippers and carriers and granting unrestricted access to said database only to said subgroup" is not considered to be old and well known in the art, as asserted in the Office action. However, this entire limitation is not what is considered to be taken for Official notice. Official notice was taken that it is old and well known in the art to define subgroups within groups and give rights to subgroups such as access to databases, and this is done in the Windows NT environment. The examiner then made an obvious statement as to the combination of the Official notice with the Prior art of record, would produce the claim limitations of "allowing a user to define a subgroup of shippers and carriers and granting unrestricted access to said database only to said subgroup". MPEP 2144.03 (C) discloses how to properly challenge the Official Notice. The applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action which would include stating why the noticed fact is not

considered to be common knowledge. The applicant has not stated WHY the fact was not common knowledge, in fact argued the claim limitation, as opposed to the noticed fact which was set forth as being old and well known in the art.

40. The remaining rejections are being argued in terms of Hunt and Williams not being combinable. As stated above, the examiner considers the motivation to combine references to be sufficient and Hunt does not teach away from the use of Williams, therefore rejections stand as stated above.

Conclusion

41. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMISUE A. PLUCINSKI whose telephone number is (571)272-6811. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (5:30 - 4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jamisue A. Plucinski/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3629